<u>**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**</u>

Claims 1-56, 63, 64, 75, and 77 have been canceled without prejudice or

disclaimer. Claims 57-62, 65-74, 76, and 78-87 are currently pending. Claims 57, 65-68, 74, 76,

78, 79, 81, and 83-87 have been amended. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added

by way of this amendment. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-

identified application, in view of the following remarks and amendments.

<u>**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103**</u>

Claims 57-63 and 74-87 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) over

Gabber et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,961,593) in view of Alkhatib (U.S. Patent No. 6,119,171).

Claims 64-73 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be

allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claims.

Applicants thank Examiner for the indication that claims 64-73 have been deemed allowable

subject matter.

Claim 64 depends from claim 63, which in turn depends from Claim 57.

Applicants have amended claim 57 to incorporate the elements of claims 63 and 64, which was

indicated as allowable subject matter. Applicants have also amended claims 65-68 to depend

from amended claim 57, such that claims 58-62 and 65-73 are currently directly or indirectly

dependent on independent claim 57, and canceled claims 63 and 64. Accordingly, Applicants

respectfully submit that independent claim 57 and claims 58-62 and 65-73 are patentably distinct

from the cited references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these

claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Independent claims 74 and 76 have been amended to recite, *inter alia*:

> A method, comprising:
>
> receiving a query from a client to resolve a domain name, the query including information identifying a destination website name corresponding to a destination server with which the client wishes to communicate;
>
> routing the query to a deceiver;
>
> forwarding the query to a controller;...
>
> initiating a forwarding session between the client and the destination server via a forwarder, wherein the client and destination server are unaware that the IP address at which their communications is directed is that of the forwarder and not that of the intended target;
>
> receiving packets from the client at the forwarder during the forwarding session;
>
> forwarding the packets from the forwarder to the destination server using the forwarder's IP address as the source address;
>
> receiving packets from the destination server at the forwarder during the forwarding session; and
>
> forwarding the packets received from the destination server to the client.

<div align="center">

*   *   *

</div>

> A computer system comprising:
>
> ...said forwarder configured to communicate with at least a controller;
>
> said controller configured to communicate with at least a deceiver, said deceiver configured to communicate with the client, wherein the deceiver receives the request by the client to initiate communication with the destination website and initiates the controller to query a domain name server to resolve the name of the destination website associated with the destination server;
>
> said controller configured to communicate with at least a domain name server to resolve the name of said destination website and

<div align="center">

- 10 -

</div>

initiate communication with the forwarder in response to the resolution of the name of the destination website associated with the destination server; and

said controller configured to store communication data for locating at least said deceiver, said domain name server, and said forwarder

said controller configured to initiate the forwarder to forward packets between the destination server and the client in response to the resolution of the name of the destination website associated with the destination server.

Applicants submit that the cited references do not disclose, teach or suggest at least the elements recited in claims 74 and 76.

The Examiner contends that the cited references render claims 74 and 76 obvious. (See, Office Action, page 4, ¶2). Applicants submit that per MPEP § 2111.01, the claims are interpreted broadly, but in light of the specification. More specifically the MPEP states, "claims are not to be read in a vacuum, and limitations therein are to be interpreted in light of the specification in giving them their 'broadest reasonable interpretation'." (Quoting *In re Okuzawa*, 537 F.2d 545, 548). Applicants dispute the Examiner's characterization of the claimed invention in the Office Action, but have amended independent claims 74 and 76 to further clarify the elements consistent with the specification and expedite prosecution. The amendments to claim 74 include the incorporation of the elements from claim 75, which has now been canceled, and the amendments to claim 76 include the incorporation of the elements from claim 77, which has also now been canceled.

Applicants submit that Examiner may have over-generalized the functionality of the deceiver, the controller and the forwarder, as one of ordinary skill in the art would understand in light of the specification and that neither Gabber, nor Alkhatib teach, disclose, or suggest the claimed invention.

Accordingly, in light of the clarifying amendments in claim 74, Applicants submit that the cited references do not teach, disclose or suggest a method that initiates a forwarding session between a client and a destination server in response to a resolution of a domain name query regarding the destination website with which a user wishes to communicate, wherein the query is routed to a deceiver that, in turn, forwards it to a controller to resolve the domain name query via a domain name server, wherein neither the client or destination server are aware of the employment of a forwarder disposed between them as recited in amended independent claim 74. Moreover, neither Gabber, nor Alkhatib, nor the combination thereof, teaches, discloses, or suggests at least the "returning a packet to the client identifying the IP address of the forwarder as the IP address of the destination server" as recited in amended claim 74.

Similarly, in light of the clarifying amendments in claim 76, Applicants submit that the cited references do not teach, disclose or suggest a computer system with a forwarder configured for employment between a client and destination server and communication with a controller, which is configured to communicate with a deceiver and domain name server and may "initiate the forwarder to forward packets between the destination server and the client in response to the resolution of the name of the destination website associated with the destination server" as recited in amended independent claim 76. Moreover, neither Gabber, nor Alkhatib,

nor the combination thereof, teaches, discloses, or suggests at least a computer system with a

forwarder is "configured to transfer packets between the client and the destination server,

wherein the client and the destination server are unaware of the employment of said forwarder."

Applicants submit that the Examiner's statement -- "It would have been obvious

to combine Alkhatib's teachings with Gabber's system for anonymous browsing because the IP

routing system would facilitate the interconnected client-server communications." -- was made in

the benefit of reviewing the claim language. (See, Office Action, page 3, ¶9). Applicants

submit that per MPEP § 2142 to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, it is essential that

(1) there be some motivation or suggestion to make the claimed invention in light of the prior art

teachings, (2) there be a reasonable expectation of success, and (3) the prior art references must

teach or suggest all the claim limitations. (See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438

(Fed. Cir. 1991); See, e.g., *In re Brouwer*, 77 F.3d 422, 37 USPQ2d 1663 (Fed. Cir. 1996)). As

per MPEP § 2143.01 the motivation or suggestion to combine or modify teachings of the prior art

must be found "either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge

generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art" and not reliant upon the level of skill in the

art to provide such a suggestion to combine references. The also states that Accordingly, a

rejection based on hindsight (i.e., using the patent claim as an instruction book) to combine or

reconstruct the prior art to arrive at the present invention is impermissible and improper.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that these

amendments place claims 74 and 76 in allowable condition. Therefore, Applicants respectfully

request withdrawal of this ground of rejection. Also, Applicants submit that claims 78-87, which

are directly or indirectly dependent on independent claim 76, are also patentably distinct from the

cited references on at least the grounds stated above for independent claim 76. Therefore,

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

CONCLUSION

It is now believed that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. In view

of these remarks, an early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: September 14, 2006   By: _____
                                                              Tony V. Pezzano
                                                              Registration No. 38,271

Correspondence Address:
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, NY 10281
(212) 415-8700 (telephone)
(212) 415-8701 (facsimile)

1017455 v1